

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,705	10/17/2003	Yuuji Sawanaga	243643US-2TTC 8805	
22850 OBLON SBIV	7590 10/26/200	EXAMINER		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			GILLIGAN, CHRISTOPHER L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/686,705	SAWANAGA ET AL.	SAWANAGA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Luke Gilligan	3626			

	Luke Gilligan	3626	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ing replies: (1) an amendment, af ice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Cl	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date	-		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of		136(a) and the appropria	te extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth In (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	, will not be entered be	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	sideration and/or search (see NO		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying t	he issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally rei	iected claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11		ceted ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	, ,,	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-3241
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amondment (1 100-024).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) the how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affiday	vit or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	does NOT place the application is	n namelikine for all accord	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowar	ce because:
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (Other: 	~10/SB/08) Paper No(s)		•
			•

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claims 31, 35, and 38 narrow the scope of the location of the predetermined threshold which requires further search and consideration of the prior art.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the remarks filed 9/19/07, Applicants rehash the position in the previous response that page 2, lines 8-11 of Applicant's Background of the Invention (ABI) cannot be relied upon as admitted prior art. The response to this argument in the previous Office Action is incorporated herein. In addition, it does not appear that ABI discloses what is "known" restricted only to Japan. Although previous statements reference a Japanese Patent Application Disclosure, the cited portion (page 2, lines 8-11) indicates what is known "in a general maintenance field." Similarly, the cited portion does not limit what is known only to the inventor, but to what is known "in a general maintenance field." Therefore, this argument is not found to be persuasive.

With respect to Applicants' remarks regarding the amended claims, since these amendments have not been entered, these arguments are currently moot.

C. LUKE OFFLIGAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600